MOTION FILED
SUPREME COURT U.S.

OCT 14 1970

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

Nos. 669, 680, 682, 683, 684, 685, 691, and 692

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 14 1970
E. ROBERT SEAVER, CLERK

Southern Louisiana Area Rate Cases

MUNICIPAL DISTRIBUTOR GROUP, *ET AL.*,
Petitioners,

v.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Respondent.

MOTION OF UNITED DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES FOR LEAVE TO FILE A BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE IN RESPONSE TO PETITIONS NOS. 669, 680, 682, 683, 684, 685, 691, and 692 AND BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE FOR UNITED DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES IN OPPOSITION TO CERTIORARI

C. WILLIAM COOPER,
Murtha, Cullina, Richter and Pinney
97 Elm Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103

TILFORD A. JONES
Suite 301
7316 Wisconsin Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Attorneys for
UNITED DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES

Of Counsel:

RICHARD F. BABCOCK
WILLIAM W. BRACKETT
PAUL E. GOLDSTEIN
Ross, Hardies, O'Keefe, Babcock, McDonald and Parsons
122 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60603

JULIAN DE BRUYN KOPS
WILLIAM E. HERRON
25 North Main Street
Dayton, Ohio 45401

RICHARD A. ROSAN
20 Montchanin Road
Wilmington, Delaware 19807

(List of Counsel continued inside front cover)

THE CASILLAS PRESS, INC.—1717 K Street, N. W.—Washington, D. C.—223-1220

Of Counsel: (Cont'd.)

NORMAN A. FLANINGAM
CHARLES R. BROWN
744 Pennsylvania Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

GEORGE H. FISCHER
P.O. Box 764
Colombia, South Carolina 29202

J. PHILIP BAHN
Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam and Roberts
40 Wall Street
New York, New York 10005

RICHARD M. MERRIMAN
PEYTON G. BOWMAN, III
Reid & Priest
1701 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

DONALD I. MORITZ
420 Boulevard of the Allies
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

ELMER NAFZIGER
Nafziger & Otten
900 Illinois Building
Springfield, Illinois 62701

JAMES O'MALLEY, JR.
RONALD D. JONES
HALCYON G. SKINNER
LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae
One Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, New York 10005

PETER V. FAZIO, JR.
Schiff, Hardin, Waite, Dorschel & Britton
231 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

ARTHUR R. SEDER, JR.
One Woodward Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48226

WILLIAM E. DOYLE
Mayer, Brown & Platt
1101 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

CHARLES V. SHANNON
Shannon & Morley
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

JAMES B. FALAHEE
212 West Michigan Avenue
Jackson, Michigan 49201

JUSTIN A. STANLEY
Mayer, Brown & Platt
231 South La Salle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

HENRY P. SULLIVAN
4 Gateway Center
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CASES	ii
MOTION	1
BRIEF	5
OPINIONS BELOW	5
JURISDICTION	6
QUESTION PRESENTED	6
STATUTE INVOLVED	7
STATEMENT	7
ARGUMENT	9

TABLE OF CASES

	Page
Atlantic Refining Co. v. Public Service Company of New York, 360 U.S. 378 (1959)	11
Permian Basin Rate Cases, 390 U.S. 747 (1968)	10

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

Nos. 669, 680, 682, 683, 684, 685, 691, and 692

Southern Louisiana Area Rate Cases

MUNICIPAL DISTRIBUTOR GROUP, *ET AL.*,
Petitioners,

v.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Respondent.

MOTION OF UNITED DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES FOR LEAVE TO FILE A BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE IN RESPONSE TO PETITIONS NOS. 669, 680, 682, 683, 684, 685, 691, and 692

The following companies are herein referred to as United Distribution Companies:

AMERICAN NATURAL GAS SYSTEM
Michigan Consolidated Gas Company
Wisconsin Gas Company

CENTRAL ILLINOIS LIGHT COMPANY

CENTRAL ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMPANY

CITIZENS GAS AND COKE UTILITY

THE DAYTON POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

EQUITABLE GAS COMPANY

ILLINOIS POWER COMPANY

MICHIGAN GAS UTILITIES COMPANY

(List of Companies continued on next page)

COLUMBIA GAS SYSTEM
Columbia Gas of Kentucky, Inc.
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.
Columbia Gas of New York, Inc.
Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc.
Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc.
Columbia Gas of West Virginia, Inc.
Ohio Valley Gas Company
Virginia Gas Distribution Company

CONSOLIDATED NATURAL GAS SYSTEM
Consolidated Gas Supply Corporation
The East Ohio Gas Company
The Peoples Natural Gas Company
The River Gas Company
West Ohio Gas Company

CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY

NATIONAL FUEL GAS SYSTEM
Iroquois Gas Corporation
Pennsylvania Gas Company
United Natural Gas Company

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION

NORTHERN ILLINOIS GAS COMPANY

ORANGE & ROCKLAND UTILITIES, INC.

THE PEOPLES GAS SYSTEM
North Shore Gas Company
The Peoples Gas Light & Coke Company

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY

United Distribution Companies (UDC) is an *ad hoc*, voluntary group of 31 distribution utilities listed above serving approximately 10,300,000 customers at retail in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia. The principal cities and metropolitan areas wholly dependent on members of the United Distribution Companies group for their supplies of gas include Albany, Buffalo, Chicago, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Detroit, Indianapolis, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh, and Syracuse. The population dependent upon the group of distribution companies is estimated to be 48,000,000 people. The United Distribution Companies Group represents approximately 25% of the gas distribution operations throughout the whole United States.

The bulk of the natural gas supplies of UDC is purchased from the major interstate pipeline companies, which in turn secure major portions of their supplies by

purchase from independent producers who operate in the *Southern Louisiana Area* and who are Respondents in the Southern Louisiana area rate cases here sought to be reviewed.

Because of the current and worsening gas shortage and of their inability to secure requisite supplies of additional gas from their pipeline suppliers, the United Distribution Companies are participating, as intervenors, in the new area rate proceeding now being conducted at Federal Power Commission Docket No. AR69-1.

Active participation in the new area rate proceedings at Docket No. AR69-1 during recent months has convinced the United Distribution Companies that the pressing supply problems facing the nation cannot adequately be dealt with and overcome solely through the prescription of higher prospective rates. Such companies are convinced that the problem can be dealt with fully and adequately only through reconsideration by the Commission of all rate and refund issues determined in its initial *Southern Louisiana Area* rate decision.

Through a brief *amicus curiae* submitted in connection with the petitions for rehearing, the UDC Companies urged the court below to remand the case to the Commission for further consideration in the light of the supply situation. While the court below affirmed the Commission, it reserved to the Commission the extraordinary power to reopen and change its order. And the issue now presented to this Honorable Court is whether this disposition by the court below should be reviewed or whether the Commission should first be permitted to reconsider and change its rate fixing order in the light of the supply situation.

United Distribution Companies believe the views they seek to present to this court will contribute to a proper resolution of the troublesome issues before this

Court and for the benefit of the ultimate consumers for whom they seek to assure not only just and reasonable rates but also adequate supplies.

WHEREFORE, United Distribution Companies respectfully request this Court to permit them to file the brief *amicus curiae* which is submitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

By
C. William Cooper
Murtha, Cullina,
Richter and Pinney
97 Elm Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103

Tilford A. Jones
Suite 301
7316 Wisconsin Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Attorneys for
UNITED DISTRIBUTION
COMPANIES

October 14, 1970

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

Nos. 669, 680, 682, 683, 684, 685, 691, and 692

Southern Louisiana Area Rate Cases

MUNICIPAL DISTRIBUTOR GROUP, *ET AL.*,
Petitioners,

v.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Respondent.

BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE FOR UNITED DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES IN OPPOSITION TO CERTIORARI

United Distribution Companies hereby submit their brief in opposition to the Petitions filed in Nos. 669, 680, 682, 683, 684, 685, 691, and 692 for writs of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals entered in this case on March 19, 1970.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals, which is included in Continental Appendix A, pp. 1-70, and its

opinion on petitions for rehearing, which is set forth in Continental Appendix B, pp. 1-3, are not yet reported.[1] The opinions of the FPC are reported at 40 FPC 530 and 40 FPC 301. The opinion of the hearing examiner is reported at 40 FPC 703.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was entered on March 19, 1970, and modified and clarified by an order denying petitions for rehearing entered on June 16, 1970. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254 (1) and Section 19(b) of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. 717r(b).

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether this Honorable Court should issue its Writ of Certiorari to review the action of the Court of Appeals in this most extraordinary case, where (1) the Court of Appeals affirmed the rate fixing order of the Commission reluctantly and with "misgivings" in the light of a dangerous supply situation, (2) the Court of Appeals specifically authorized the Commission, as part of the remedy of the case, to reopen its rate order and make such adjustments therein as the "public interest" may require, and (3) the Commission has not yet had an opportunity to act in the public interest pursuant to the mandate of the Court of Appeals.

---

[1] In No. 680, Continental Oil Company, *et al.*, Petitioners, filed appendices to their petition containing the complete text of opinions and judgments below as well as the agency's opinions and statues involved.

STATUTE INVOLVED

Sections 4(a), 4(e), 5(a), 16 and 19(b) of the Natural Gas Act, 52 Stat. 821, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 717-717w, are involved and are reproduced at Continental Appendix F, pp. 1-8.

STATEMENT

The statement of Continental Oil Company *et al* at Docket No. 680 includes a full analysis of the decisions of the Federal Power Commission and of the Court of Appeals and for the sake of brevity we adopt that statement of the case, and make the following additional statements:

When petitions for rehearing were filed, the Court of Appeals questioning *inter alia* whether the Commission could modify the affirmed order since it does not have the power to make rates retroactively, directed the Commission to respond to questions as to whether: (a) the Commission could stay, modify, and rescind an order that had been affirmed; and (b) the Court had equitable powers to affirm while preserving the Commission's power to stay, modify, or rescind.

The Commission took the position that it would not have authority to make any retroactive increases or decreases in a rate order unless authorized to do so by the Court. It stated that the question with respect to "equitable powers" had not been decided. In conclusion, the Commission, by a 3 to 2 vote, requested the Court to remand the case so the Commission could discharge its responsibilities consistent with the Court's opinion.

On the petitions for rehearing, the Court again affirmed the order and stated:

> "We wish to make crystal clear the authority of the Commission in this case to reopen any

part of its order that circumstances require be reopened. Under section 19(b) of the Natural Gas Act, this Court has the broad remedial powers that inhere in a court of equity, and pursuant to our equitable powers we make it part of the remedy in this case that the authority of the Commission to reopen any part of its orders, including those affecting revenues from gas already delivered, is left intact. The Commission can make retrospective as well as prospective adjustments in this case if it finds that it is in the public interest to do so.

"At the same time, we emphasize that our judgment is an affirmance and not a remand. The appropriate place for originally considering what parts of the orders must be reopened in the light of new evidence is before the Commission. It may be that the Commission will decide that the refunds it has ordered are just and reasonable or at least that their significance to the public interest is outweighed by the confusion and delay that would result from their reopening. In this event, the Commission will allow its refund orders to stand as they are. Or it may be that the refunds are too burdensome in light of new evidence to be in the public interest. In that case, it is our judgment that the Commission shall have the power and the duty to remedy the situation by changing its orders.

"In all other respects, the original opinion of this Court is the final disposition of this appeal."

Promptly after issuance of the Court's order on June 16, 1970, the Commission entered an order on July 2, 1970, staying its own orders, effective upon dissolution of the Court's stay. Such order is still in effect.

United Distribution Companies have been active in hearings before the Commission in the new *Southern Louisiana Area Rate Case*, AR69-1. Executives of the various United Distribution Companies have testified with respect to the present gas shortage. A United Distribution Companies witness from the financial community also has testified with respect to the enormous capital requirements of the energy industries if the energy requirements of this country are to be met during this decade.

United Distribution Companies propose to participate actively before the Commission in any reopening of the *Southern Louisiana Area Rate Case* here under review.

ARGUMENT

In the presence of the natural gas shortage now facing the Nation, we cannot sufficiently emphasize the importance of this case to natural gas distribution utilities, to the millions of consumers dependent upon them for utility service, and indeed to the public welfare.

The rates fixed for the Southern Louisiana Area must be adequate to provide producers with an incentive to devote immense new quantities of capital to exploration and development and bring the necessary new supplies into the interstate market. A wrong decision upon any part of this whole problem, including the ordering of unduly burdensome refunds, can have disastrous consequences for the interstate consumers.

When the hearings in the *Southern Louisiana Area Rate Case* concluded more than five years ago, hardly anyone foresaw the current gas supply shortage. Although some signs of an impending gas shortage were visible by the time the Commission issued the Opinions and Orders now under review, the full magnitude of the problem was not readily apparent.

By the time that the case reached the Court of Appeals on review, however, the situation had been somewhat clarified. *A Staff Report on National Gas Supply and Demand*, issued in September 1969, was before the Court; and the Court refers to fact that it shows; "perhaps a certainty, that the supply of gas is dangerously low" (Continental Appendix A, p. 52).

The Court of Appeals recognized that this Court held in *Permian* (*Permian Basin Area Rate Cases*, 390 US 747 (1968)) that "adequate findings" would be required in the future, but noted that the Commission had left gaps similar to the omissions criticized by this Court in *Permian*. Thus, the Court of Appeals found ". . . the Commission failed to approach supply and demand in either a semi-quantitative or qualitative way" (Continental Appendix A, pp. 49-50), and listed defect after defect in "findings" on related questions of supply, demand, and actual availability of capital to the industry at rates prescribed (Continental Appendix A, pp. 52-69). The court also noted existence of more current data available to the Commission, including the study by the Commission's Staff released in September, 1969, which indicates "perhaps a certainty, that the supply of gas is dangerously low" and "a serious shortage, in fact, may already be unavoidable" (Continental Appendix A, p. 52). In sum, the court found that the assessment of the crucial facts as to supply, demand, and impact of prescribed rates called for by *Permian* had not been made in this case.

The Natural Gas Act, in addition to obligating the Commission to fix "just and reasonable" rates, requires that rates be fixed at levels consistent with the maintenance of an adequate level of service. *Atlantic Refining Co. v. Public Service Commission of New York*, 360 U.S. 378 (1959). The Commission, thus, has a duty to set rates at levels which will obtain the gas needed by interstate consumers. But, it is apparent that the ceiling prices established for the Southern Louisiana Area are inadequate to meet the projected demands. Higher prices will play a vital role in encouraging producers to search for, develop and produce new reserves and in inducing them to dedicate such reserves to the interstate marketplace. Conversely, price "rollbacks" and unduly burdensome refunds will discourage these activities by drawing off capital badly needed for the expansion of exploration and production.

If the rates fixed under Opinion Nos. 546 and 546-A are placed into effect, it is estimated that the producers will be required immediately to refund $375 million at a time when capital is scarce and expensive.[2] To impose such an obligation on the producing industry would drastically reduce the already limited amount of new capital needed to finance new exploratory ventures and would accentuate the present shortages.

The opinions of the Court of Appeals are shot through with expressions of concern over the worsening supply situation and over the probability that the ordered rates and refunds will not provoke its correction. Plainly, the court concluded that further Commission action, through the application of its expertise to the

---

[2] The Commission order was based primarily on 1960 data and did not give material recognition to the inflation of the 1960s. The gas requirements of the 1970s cannot be met at the revenue levels of the late 1950s.

developed demand and supply problem, is the best and most effective manner of responding to the situation in the public interest.

Plainly, also the Commission, in the light of the Staff Report and other data now available, shares this deep concern and desires to act, for it requested a remand of the case.

In our opinion, further action by the Commission, well grounded on proper findings as to the supply and demand problem, and as to the bearing of rates and refunds upon its solution, is essential in the public interest; and, until such action is taken, we believe that further review of the case is premature.

WHEREFORE United Distribution Companies respectfully suggest that the public interest will be best served if this Honorable Court denies the Petitions for Writs of Certiorari presented herein.

Respectfully submitted,

C. William Cooper
Murtha, Cullina,
Richter & Pinney
97 Elm Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103

Tilford A. Jones
Suite 301,
7316 Wisconsin Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Attorneys for
UNITED DISTRIBUTION
COMPANIES

October 14, 1970

LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 14 1970
E. ROBERT SEAVER, CLERK

Nos. 680, et al.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1970

Continental Oil Company, et al.,
Petitioners,

v.

Federal Power Commission,
Respondent.

RESPONSE OF E. COCKRELL, JR. TO PETITIONS IN NOS. 680, 681, 682, 683 AND 695

Of Counsel:

Butler, Binion, Rice,
Cook & Knapp
1100 Esperson Building
Houston, Texas 77002

Cecil N. Cook
Neal Powers, Jr.
Daniel B. Benbow
1100 Esperson Building
Houston, Texas 77002

Attorneys for
E. Cockrell, Jr.

Fidelity Printing Company, Inc., Houston

Nos. 680, et al.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1970

Continental Oil Company, et al.,
Petitioners,

v.

Federal Power Commission,
Respondent.

RESPONSE OF E. COCKRELL, JR. TO PETITIONS IN NOS. 680, 681, 682, 683 AND 685

E. Cockrell, Jr. (Cockrell), a respondent in Nos. 669, 691 and 692, and a petitioner in No. 684, hereby responds to the petitions in Nos. 680, 681, 682, 683 and 685, which such latter petitions also seek writs of certiorari to review the judgment and opinions entered by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in this same case on March 19, 1970, and June 16, 1970. In response to these petitions, Cockrell would show as follows:

1. In Nos. 669, 691, and 692, Cockrell is filing a brief opposing such petitions.

2. In Nos. 680, 681, 682, 683 and 685, Cockrell does not oppose the granting of such petitions. In the event such

petitions are granted, Cockrell would be aligned with the petitioners and not with the respondent Federal Power Commission.

Respectfully submitted,

Of Counsel:

BUTLER, BINION, RICE,
COOK & KNAPP
1100 Esperson Building
Houston, Texas 77002

CECIL N. COOK
NEAL POWERS, JR.
DANIEL B. BENBOW
1100 Esperson Building
Houston, Texas 77002

Attorneys for
E. COCKRELL, JR.

October 14, 1970